



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/577,231

05/23/2000

Lundy Lewis

019287-0317297

3634

909 7590 10/30/2009

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2443

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/30/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/577,231	Applicant(s) LEWIS, LUNDY	
	Examiner DAVID E. ENGLAND	Art Unit 2443	

All Participants:

(1) DAVID E. ENGLAND.

(2) Syed Jafar Ali Reg. No. 58780.

Status of Application: Amendment after Non-Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2009

Time: 10:30 am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

4,13,27,49

Prior art documents discussed:

none

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/David E. England/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted the Attorney of record to discuss the claims and possible amendments to the claims to have them allowed. Examiner stated that claim 4 was not allowable but claims 13, 27 and 49 would be allowable if they applied a small amendment. The final paragraph/limitation has an "or" statement which could be interpreted as an alternative instead of both, i.e., in the specification it states that the invention looks at both domain information, the "or" statement would leave one to interpret that only one would have to be domain would have to be looked at. The Attorney of record stated that they could break up the limitation to determine which domain and the identifying at least one in that domain to have caused the problem. Examiner awaits the Attorney's claim draft to finalize the amendment. Furthermore, a terminal disclaimer would have to be filed so Double patenting rejections can be avoided with applications 09/577232, 09577224 and patent 7600007. .